



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,388	10/21/2003	Vladimir Gurevich	1549	2379
7590	10/20/2005		EXAMINER	
			QI, ZHI QIANG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/690,388	GUREVICH ET AL. <i>M</i>
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Mike Qi	2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
     1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
     2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
     3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

The previous final rejection has been withdrawal. A rejection is presented as follows.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-11, 13-20 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,462,805 B1 (Wu et al) in view of US 4,093,356 (Bigelow).

Regarding claims 1, 8, 10, 18, 20 and 26, Wu discloses (col.6, line 57 – col.7, line 54; Figs.3A,3B) that a liquid crystal display comprising:

- back light (light source 350 and mirror 360) on a bottom surface of the display device for generating light and transmitting light;
- circular polarizer (330B) (first circular polarizer) having lower side adjacent to a upper side of the circular polarizer (330B);
- liquid crystal display (320) having a lower side adjacent to a upper side of the back light (350, 360);
- transreflective mirror (340) (two-way mirror) is positioned on the outer surface of the rear substrate (310-B) (out surface of the LCD), i.e., having a upper side adjacent to a lower side of the liquid crystal display;

circular polarizer (330-A) (second circular polarizer) having a lower side adjacent to the lower side of the liquid crystal display; and the circular polarizer having the function to absorb the reflected external incident light and transmitted light, and that is the property of the circular polarizer.

Wu does not explicitly disclose a first circular X-polarizer and a second circular X-polarizer (both be X-polarizers).

Bigelow discloses (col.3, line 5 – col.4, line 52; Figure) that using a circular X-polarizer (40) with a quarter-wave plate (35) having polarization in X-direction and to emerge light beam having circular polarization (functions as the first circular X-polarizer), and a circular polarizer with a quarter wave plate (25) having polarization in X-direction to emerge light beam having circular polarization (functions as the second circular X-polarizer) (both be X-polarization direction 41 and 52a as shown in the Figure), and such transflective display obtaining transmissive display and facilitate use of the display in a reflective mode (see col.1, lines 55 – 68), thus improving the light utilization efficiency.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the circular polarizer of Wu with the teachings of the combination of the linear X-polarizer and the  $\lambda/4$  plate as taught by Bigelow, since the skilled in the art would be motivated for improving the light utilization efficiency (see col.1, lines 55 – 68).

Regarding claims 3 and 13, Wu discloses (col.4, lines 36-39) that the device is a transflective display.

Regarding claims 4-5, 14-15, Wu discloses (col.4, lines 36-39) that the device is a reflective display using a front-lit (front light).

Regarding claim 11, Wu discloses (Figs.3A,3B) that using a liquid crystal display (310-A, 320, 310-B) between the two circular polarizers (330-A, 330-B) generating images.

Regarding claims 6-7, 9, 16-17 and 19, Wu teaches the invention set forth above. Wu lacks that the first and second X-polarizers arranged on the outer surface and quarter-wave plates on the inner surface.

Bigelow discloses (col.3, line 5 – col.4, line 52; Figure) that the first and second X-polarizers arranged on the outer surface and quarter-wave plate on the inner surface, such as shown in the Figure, the circular polarization vector (82a) and (52a), so that the X-polarizers are arranged on the out surface and the quarter-wave plates on the inner surface, and such transflective display obtaining transmissive display and facilitate use of the display in a reflective mode (see col.1, lines 55 – 68), thus improving the light utilization efficiency.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the circular polarizer of Wu with the teachings of the combination of the linear X-polarizer and the  $\lambda/4$  plate as taught by Bigelow, since the skilled in the art would be motivated for improving the light utilization efficiency (see col.1, lines 55 – 68).

Art Unit: 2871

3. Claims 2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu and Bigelow as applied to claims 1, 3-11, 13-20 and 26 above, and further in view of US 6,738,117 B2 (Minakuchi).

Regarding claims 2 and 12, Wu and Bigelow teach the invention set forth above.

Wu and Bigelow lack using touch pad between the second (upper) circular polarizer and liquid crystal display.

Minakuchi discloses (col.6, lines 58 – 64; Fig.8) that using touch panel (4) as a transparent protection plate. Minakuchi indicates (col.1, lines 40-41) that a polarizing plate and a quarter-wave plate would obtain a circular polarizing plate, so that the polarizing plate (2) and quarter-wave plate (1) would form a circular polarizer. Therefore, the touch panel (4) is arranged between the circular polarizer and the liquid crystal display (20). Minakuchi indicates (col.1, line 66 – col.2, line 2) that such protection plate (using touch panel as a transparent protection plate) improves the brightness, visibility and viewing angle characteristic of the display.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the liquid crystal display of Wu and Bigelow with the teachings of a touch pad between the circular polarizer and the liquid crystal display as taught by Minakuchi, since the skilled in the art would be motivated for achieving the improvement of the brightness, visibility and viewing angle characteristic of the display and protecting the viewing screen (see col.1, line 66-col.2, line 2), and the combination of the touch panel with circular polarizing plate would improve coloring of a displayed view in an oblique direction (see col.2, lines 4-8).

4. Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu and Bigelow as applied to claims 1, 3-11, 13-20 and 26 above, and further in view of US 6,642,977 B2 (Kotchick et al).

Regarding claim 21-23, Wu and Bigelow teach the invention set forth above. Wu and Bigelow lack that the display device is used in a computing device having a processor processing data, such as a mobile computing device having wireless communication arrangement.

Kotchick discloses (col. 18, lines 6-33;Fig.9-10) that using computer system having processing unit (CPU) processing data, such as using phone to collect data, and through wireless connection being connected to a computer network, and that the liquid crystal display used in the computing device would only given weight as an intended use as any display can be used in that computing device, and that would have been at least obvious.

5. Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu, Bigelow and Kotchick as applied to claims 1, 3-11, 13-20, 26 and 21-23 above, and further in view of US 5,548,108 (Moldskred et al).

Regarding claims 24-25, Wu, Bigelow and Kotchick teach the invention set forth above. Wu, Bigelow and Kotchick lack a data capturing arrangement obtaining data, such as using barcode reader or RFID reader.

Moldskred discloses (col.1, lines 20-53) that it is known in the art to use a non-contact scanning device to cause a beam of light to scan across an area containing a barcode, and such scanning symbols would decode and store data fast where a large

Art Unit: 2871

number of symbols are read within a short period of time, and that is used in the known market.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the liquid crystal display of Wu, Bigelow and Kotchick with the teachings of data capturing arrangement obtaining data, such as using barcode reader or RFID reader as taught by Moldskred, since the skilled in the art would be motivated for achieving a large number of symbols are read within a short period of time (see col.1, lines 20-53).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Qi whose telephone number is (571) 272-2299. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 8:00 am-5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim can be reached on (571) 272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2871

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mike Qi  
October 18, 2005

*Andrew Schechter*  
ANDREW SCHECHTER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER